

Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for their bottom line and less of what we need for a democracy. Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard.

Can a large media owner, like Sinclair Broadcasting, refuse to show a program listing the names of the military Iraq war dead by calling it biased and then pre-empt regular programming to show an editorial opinion, dare to call it un-biased news and get away with it?

Sinclair Broadcast Group is in the business of informing the American electorate, and makes its profits using public property - the public airwaves. Shouldn't they be held to some fairly high standards? I hope so. I hope you will do so.

Thank you.